JL- re posssible 0322 remand HW 8/16/84

While,going over records for Theoharis this afternoon I noticed that although ultimately serialized in 89-43 a Jim Bishop record was originally designated for 80-879 by the SAC.

In fact, both of the original copies are designated for two different 80 files, the second appearing to be 943. Another in this series of Bishop records, of which I believe I provided copies to you, has a note on it to make a new 80 file.

Now according to the Central File publication, the field offices do not us NR copies, but here, clearly, they have a similar system. Moreover, the serialized copy, if it is the only suach as the FBI's publication represents, is in an incomplete file. The added note states that the list Bishop submitted is in the 80 file.

While I now do not have any clear recollection of it, I believe I went into the field office use of this "Laboratory Research Matters" file classification for other and entirely unrelated matters, include what can be regarded by the FBI as delicate.

I know I identified relevant New Orleans 80 files, without response, and now we have proof that Dallas 80 files are relevant and undearched.

- - - -

On another matter: this morning I mailed you a fat envelope I got together last evening after writ8ing Huff and when I was a little less than first-rate. Today I got back to that copying, what I did not intend for you but for filing here, and I wondered if I'd made a mistake in what I sent you. So I counted the pages of the enclosures with Huff's 8/6/ Aside from what I sent you for Bud from that disclosure, you should have 32 pp. to have all that Huff sent. If you do not, while there is nothing of great significance,let me know and I'll be sure you have a complete set. Please remind me that the originals are at the very back of Cabinet L-8.

Whatever else the field offices use 80 for, it is apparent that they use it for press contacts and that is why after my request they destroyed all those JFK 80 records in N.O. This is in the case record.